

### **III. REMARKS**

1. The claims are amended to address the noted objections.
2. The claims are amended to address the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §101.
3. Claims 1-2 are not anticipated by Fujiwara under 35 USC §102(e). In order for a reference to anticipate a claim, each and every feature recited in the claim must be explicitly found in the reference. This is not the case with Fujiwara. Fujiwara merely discloses that copyright data pertaining to the software that is stored on a client 120 is maintained in a registry 355. This is the type of information that is collected, recognized, process and display by Applicant, when such copyright data is collected from "multiple platforms." Fujiwara is only concerned with the software that is loaded onto a single client, and is not concerned, and is absolutely silent as to collecting attribute data such as copyright data from a document processing apparatus as is recited by Applicant in the claims.

Claim 1 recites that the "copy attribute data" from the document processing apparatus is collected, recognized, processed and displayed. There is no such disclosure in Fujiwara. Fujiwara is directed to a system that creates a substitute registry when automatically installing an update program. The install modules automatically create unique substitute registries that correspond to the downloaded update programs. (Abstract). A client system 120 downloads selected software programs from network 100. (Col. 5, lines 8-10) A client 120 includes a non-volatile memory 240 that includes client registries 355. (See FIG. 3; Col. 5, lines 24-55). The client registries include relevant information related to the various software programs and modules residing on client 120. (Col. 6, lines 25-31). The client registries 355 are typically modified to reflect the new updated status of software programs residing on client 120. (Col. 6, lines 53-56). A substitute

registry 825 can include miscellaneous information 918. (Col. 9, lines 44-47). The miscellaneous information 918 may include a copyright notice. (Col. 10, lines 3-6)

Although, Fujiwara discloses that the structure and configuration of the individual software programs included in the client registries 355 can be view and accessed by a system user displaying client registries 355 (Col. 6, lines 49-53), Fujiwara does not disclose or suggest a system manager that "collects" copyright data from platform controllers in a document processing apparatus as is claimed by Applicant. The client 120 of Fujiwara does not "collect" copyright data from platform controllers in a document processing apparatus. Rather, the client 120 of Fujiwara maintains the registry 355 that includes relevant information related to the various software programs and modules residing on client 120. (Col. 6, lines 25-31). Thus, the client 120 of Fujiwara only has copyright information related to the software stored on that client 120. Applicant's claims are directed to collecting the copyright information that is stored on a client, such as client 120 of Fujiwara. Thus, claim 1 recites "collecting" attribute data from platform controllers in the document processing apparatus. Client 120 of Fujiwara does not "collect" copyright data. Fujiwara only discloses that a registry 355 is modified, or a substitute registry 825 created, to reflect the new updated status of software programs residing on client 120. (Col. 6, lines 53-56). Client 120 does not "collect" from "multiple platforms" as claimed by Applicant. Thus, at least this feature is not anticipated by Fujiwara.

There is also no disclosure in Fujiwara related to processing the copyright data into a "list" as is claimed by Applicant. FIG. 9 and Col. 10, lines 3-6 only discloses that the miscellaneous information can include a copyright notice. The fact that the download module 430 preferably performs a comparison procedure between one or more downloaded files 420 listed on the network page 410 and the software programs currently installed on client 120 is not the same as and does not disclose collecting attribute data including copyright data, recognizing the copyright data and processing the copyright data into a list as is claimed by Applicant.

The comparison procedure 604 of Fujiwara referred to by the Examiner, which is described with respect to FIG. 10, is related to comparing the downloaded file and the client software in order to determine whether an update is required. The download module 420 determines whether matching versions of the update program 520 currently exist in both the download file 420 and the client 120. If matching versions of the update program 520 currently exist in both download file 420 and on client 120 then no update procedure is required. (Col. 10, lines 31-41). There is no disclosure here or elsewhere related to disclose collecting attribute data including copyright data, recognizing the copyright data and processing the copyright data into a list as is claimed by Applicant.

Claim 1 also recites that the selected attribute data in the "list" is displayed to the user. There is no such disclosure in Fujiwara. All that is disclosed in Fujiwara is that details of the individual software programs included in client registries 355 can be viewed and accessed. This is not the same as the "list" of "copyright data" that is collected recognized and processed as claimed by Applicant.

Since each and every element of claim 1 is not explicitly found in Fujiwara, claim one cannot be anticipated. Claims 2 and 16-21 should be allowable at least by reason of their respective dependencies.

3. Claims 3-21 are not unpatentable over Fujiwara in view of Teare et al. ("Teare") under 35 USC §103(a). The combination of Fujiwara and Teare does not disclose or suggest each element recited by Applicant in the claims, there is no motivation to combine the references and the references are non-analogous art.

The combination of Teare with Fujiwara does disclose or suggest each feature of Applicant's claimed invention. Claim 3 recites collecting attribute data from platform controllers, where the attribute data includes copyright data pertaining to software in the document processing apparatus. Teare merely discloses a "crawler" that polls a website

for updates to a name file. (Col. 18, lines 18-22). There is no disclosure of “**collecting**” attribute data from platform controllers in a document processing apparatus where the attribute data includes copyright data pertaining to software on the document processing apparatus. Thus, at least this feature claimed by Applicant is not disclosed or suggested.

There is no motivation to combine Fujiwara with Teare to achieve Applicant’s claimed subject matter. Fujiwara is directed to creating a substitute registry when automatically installing an update program. Teare seeks to associate metadata with network resources and locating the network resources. Allowing Fujiwara’s mechanism to “navigate a network resource based upon its name and without mis-direction caused by a meta-tag in the network resource” has no relationship to managing attribute data in a document processing apparatus where a system controller in the document processing apparatus polls at least two platform controllers in the document processing apparatus for attribute data, collects the attribute data from the at least two platform controllers in response to the step of polling, and displays the collected attribute data on a user display of the document processing apparatus for managing attribute data in the document processing apparatus. Thus, Teare’s teaching have no relationship or bearing on Fujiwara.

Applicant’s claimed invention is directed to “managing attribute data” in a “multiple platform architecture”. As recited in claim 1, attribute data is collected, copyright data is recognized and the copyright data is processed. Teare is directed to navigating network resources based on metadata. This is not directed toward Applicant’s claimed invention and is not analogous to the claims.

Thus, Applicant respectfully submits that there is no motivation as required under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) to combine Teare with Fujiwara . In formulating a rejection under 35

U.S.C. §103(a) based upon a combination of prior art elements, "it remains necessary to identify the reason why a person of ordinary skill in the art would have combined the prior art elements in the manner claimed." (quoting from USPTO memorandum dated May 3, 2007 on the Supreme Court decision on KSR Int'l Co., v. Teleflex, Inc.) The Examiner reason to combine references does not have any similarity or relationship to the subject matter to which Applicant's claims are directed. Applicant's claims are directed to "managing attribute data" in a "multiple platform architecture by "polling" platforms for attribute data, collecting the attribute data and displaying the collected attribute data on a user display. Nothing Fujiwara or Teare, or the combination thereof, is similar to "polling" platforms for attribute data, "collecting" the attribute data and "displaying" the collected data on a user display as claimed by Applicant. Fujiwara does not disclose or suggest these features for the reasons state earlier. Neither Teare nor Fujiwara is pertinent to the problem addressed by Applicant, which is the collection of attribute data. Thus, Teare is not analogous art and cannot be combined with Fujiwara for purposes of 35 U.S.C. §103(a).

Thus, the features of claim 3 cannot be and are not disclosed or suggested by the proposed combination of Fujiwara and Schwartz. The features of independent claim 12 is similarly not disclosed or suggested. The dependent claims should be allowable at least by reasons of their respective dependencies.

For all of the foregoing reasons, it is respectfully submitted that all of the claims now present in the application are clearly novel and patentable over the prior art of record, and are in proper form for allowance. Accordingly, favorable reconsideration and allowance is respectfully requested. Should any unresolved issues remain, the Examiner is invited to call Applicants' attorney at the telephone number indicated below.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge payment for any fees associated with this communication or credit any over payment to Deposit Account No. 16-1350.

Respectfully submitted,



Geza C. Ziegler, Jr.  
Reg. No. 44,004  
Perman & Green, LLP  
99 Hawley Lane  
Stratford, CT 06614  
(203) 259-1800 Ext. 226  
Customer No.: 2512

24 August 2009

Date